DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 213 TM 009 734

AUTHOR Christner, C. A.; And Others
TITLE Competency-Based Teacher Evaluation in a School District: Validation of the Competencies' Importance By District Administrators, Professionals, Students and Parents. Publication Number 78.69.
INSTITUTION Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (63rd, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Job Analysis; Parent Attitudes; *Rating Scales; Secondary School Teachers; Student Opinion; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Educators; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teaching Skills; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS Austin School District TX; Texas (Austin)

ABSTRACT

As part of the Austin Independent School District's revision of its Professional Personnel Evaluation System, a study was conducted to determine the components of a teacher competency-based evaluation instrument. The procedure was comprised of: (1) identification of resources for compiling essential teacher skills--such as literature reviews, lists of teacher behaviors, input from advisory committees, and reviews of existing evaluation forms; (2) development of an edited list of teacher competencies and skills; (3) development of a form to survey experts and interested groups about the competencies listed; (4) revision of the list based on survey results; and (5) use of the instrument. Input was solicited from students, parents, teachers, school administrators, and professors of education. After factor analysis and intraclass correlations were performed, 63 competencies were chosen. These competencies were grouped into six categories: personal qualities, procedural and recordkeeping skills, instructional skills, classroom management skills, expertise in basic skills and subject areas, and interpersonal skills. In addition to teacher evaluation, one of the major goals in developing the evaluation instrument was for use in staff development purposes. Plans were formulated to compile the data from the evaluation forms and to analyze the ratings. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177213

COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EVALUATION IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT: VALIDATION OF THE COMPETENCIES' IMPORTANCE BY DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS, PROFESSIONALS, STUDENTS AND PARENTS

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Education Research Association

April, 1979

Authors: C. A. Christner, Ph.D.
Office of Research and Evaluation
Austin Independent School District

D. Malitz
R & D Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas at Austin

C. L. Kugle
R & D Center for Teacher Education
University of Texas at Austin

D. S. Calkins, Ph.D.
Counterpoint Systems, Inc.

Publication Number 78.69

Office of Research and Evaluation
Austin Independent School District
Austin, Texas

TM009 734

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C.A. Christner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EVALUATION IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT: VALIDATION OF THE COMPETENCIES' IMPORTANCE BY DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS, PROFESSIONALS, STUDENTS AND PARENTS

For the school year 1977-78, the Austin Independent School District (AISD) Board of Trustees set a high priority on revising its Professional Personnel Evaluation System. In the summer of 1977, the Board did not adopt a system devised by a teacher/principal committee. This Board-appointed committee had gathered a great deal of input in the two years of its existence, but legal problems created by vagueness of criteria and time demand problems of administrators led to its not being adopted.

The Board then decided to turn the development of a new system over to the Department of Staff Personnel with the technical assistance of the Office of Research and Evaluation. A December 1, 1977 deadline was established. The two offices agreed that the literature on competencies and their validation should be surveyed, then the competencies should be compiled, the entire professional and administrative staff of AISD should be surveyed on the importance of these competencies and from the compilation of the ratings of the competencies' importance, the final evaluation instruments should be developed. Since the Department of Staff Personnel was involved with staffing all summer, the Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) agreed to do the literature review and then conduct the competency survey within the district. Even though counselors and librarians were included, this paper is limited to a discussion of teacher items only.

At this time, ORE was fortunate to become involved with the Evaluation of Teaching (EOT) project at the University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The involvement of EOT with ORE was made possible by the support and encouragement of the National Institute of Education, the sponsoring agency of the R & D Center for Teacher Education. The EOT staff members were told of the need to develop the new evaluation system in five months by a December 1, 1977 deadline. An agreement was made to provide help in three ways: to survey the literature through ERIC and any other relevant sources; to provide technical assistance in computer generating the survey forms and finally to analyze the data from the surveys.

A much more in-depth description of the competency surveying process and the evaluation system developed can be obtained (at cost) from Dr. Christner, Office of Research and Evaluation, Austin Independent School District, 6100 Guadalupe, Box 79, Austin, Texas 78752.

In July of 1977, the EOT staff conducted an ERIC search and contacted a number of researchers who had developed competency-based evaluation instruments. The literature and contact with other researchers revealed similar studies, all utilizing the same basic procedure as AISD had independently already planned to follow to develop and validate competency-based teacher evaluation instruments.

The projects contacted included: The Florida State University/Florida State Department of Education Competency Study (Carey, Note 1; Wilson; 1976); the West Georgia project on a competency-based teacher certification system (Soar, Coker and Lorentz, Note 2 and Lorentz, Note 3); and research from the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, conducted by the California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (MacDonald, 1976).

The procedure usually involves the following steps:

1. Identification of resources for essential teacher skills and competencies. Resources usually include relevant literature reviews (Borich and Fenton, 1977; Medley, Note 4; Rosenshine, 1971); extant catalogues of teacher behaviors (Dodl, Gant, Nelson and Jung, 1971); input from advisory committes, and review of other school districts' evaluation instruments.

2. Development of an edited list of skills and competencies through the elimination of ambiguous and redundant items.

3. Development of a group reaction form for the purpose of surveying a sample of the "experts" and concerned individuals about the competencies identified. The format of the form varies generally with the needs and objectives of the school district (Thomas and Kay, 1974).

4. Revision of the list of skills and competencies based on the results of the survey.

5. Actual use of the competency-based instrument for staff development, improving teacher training programs, evaluation, etc.

Method

The AISD competency survey proceeded primarily as outlined above. After studying all the materials collected, it was decided to use the competency categories developed by the earlier Board-appointed committee since so much district input had gone into selecting them. The literature (most particularly the Florida competency study) supported the validity of the choice -- I. Personal and Professional Qualities (A. Personal Qualities and B. Procedural and Record-Keeping Skills), II. Teaching Effectiveness (A. Instructional Skills, B. Classroom Management Skills, C. Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas) and III. Interpersonal Skills.

The competencies were condensed to 90 items (see Appendix A) and grouped under these categories as appropriate.

Next, instruments were designed to collect the district staff's input on these competencies. Several different types of information were requested, but the one dealt with in this paper is a rating of how important each competency was to teacher performance (1=No Value, 5= Essential) Although all the district professional and administrative staff were to be surveyed, the number of items given to each person was limited according to the number in each group (i.e. elementary principals) to be surveyed. The teacher groups received 16 items on a computer-generated form (Appendix B). Each item on each form was randomly selected and randomly ordered via computed program. The school administrators received 45 items on their survey. The central office instructional administrators (i.e. instructional coordinators) received all 90 items as did parents and University of Texas education professors. The sample of high school students received one of six sets of forms with 15 items per form.

During September and October, ORE sent all the district professionals and building-level administrators a survey through the school mail. With one follow-up letter to the schools and other building locations, an 80% return rate was obtained from these groups. Since the timeline was so pressing, additional follow-ups could not be pursued.

In October, ORE met with the Central Office Administrators in group meetings and administered the surveys at that time. The Associate Dean of the College of Education at U.T. distributed the U.T. educator surveys and returned the completed surveys to ORE at the end of October. The students in three eleventh-grade social studies classes (chosen to avoid ability grouping) in three Austin high schools (to best represent the district student makeup) were administered the student surveys. The parent group completing the survey was rather small due to a low return rate from both the Citizens for Better Schools and a city wide PTA Association. The surveys were given to the members who agreed to participate in their regular monthly meetings. The surveys were returned in a stamped, self-addressed envelope given out with the survey.

The data from the surveys were keypunched. The EOT staff then analyzed the data in early November so the final items to be on the evaluation instrument could be selected. The mean ratings of several major district staff groups were used to select items. The groups dealt with in this paper (the groups used for the teacher items) were: elementary teachers (N=1020); secondary teachers (N=680); elementary special education teachers (N=172); secondary special education teachers (N=58); other special education teachers (N=50); elementary administrators (N=65); secondary administrators (N=56); secondary assistant directors and secondary instructional coordinators (N=20); elementary director and area directors, elementary coordinators

and bilingual instructional specialists (N=31); parents (N=32); University of Texas at Austin education professors (N=65) and AISD eleventh grade students (N=240).

Results

Initial analyses of the results of the surveys allowed for the consensual selection of the final items for the teacher competency instrument. The mean ratings of the items by the district groups were used to determine which items to keep or eliminate. Because of the uniformly high ratings, (nearly all items were rated at 4.0 - very valuable to performance, or better) very stingent criteria were applied to delete enough items to make the final list manageable. The University professors' ratings were not used in item elimination. An item was eliminated if there were no mean response ratings by district staff above 4.5 and if one or more mean ratings were 4.0 or below. Finally a few more items were eliminated by applying the following rule: If either students or parents rated a competency low and other ratings were consistently below 4.25, the item was eliminated. Based on these ratings the final 63 teacher competency items were selected (see Appendix A).

Additional analyses to be reported on now were done after the system was developed to further assess the validity of the ratings by trying to gauge the amount of intergroup agreement on the questionnaire as a whole. While in a strict sense this is a reliability analysis, it has some bearing on validity, for agreement among groups of experts on the importance of various competencies can be viewed as consensual validation of the competencies.

Agreement was assessed on the basis of mean ratings of each of the 90 items for each of the 12 groups of judges. This matrix of mean ratings was then analyzed using the methods of factor analysis and intraclass correlation.

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed on the mean ratings of the 90 competency items between all possible pairing of groups. Each correlation in the resulting matrix indicates the degree to which two groups agreed in their ratings of items. This correlation matrix is presented in Table 1. As can be seen that all correlations in this matrix are significant ($p < .001$) and generally high, ranging from .87 to .36 with a median of .605. From this matrix, each group's median correlation with the other 11 groups was determined. These median correlations are presented in Table 2. It can be seen that all of the medians are rather high, indicating general agreement among the groups. However, it should be noted that two groups (parents and high school students) have somewhat lower medians than the other groups, indicating that they rated the items somewhat differently.

A principle components factor analysis was performed on the correlation matrix in which the 90 items were considered subjects and the rating groups were considered variables. The emergence of more than one sizable factor (clustering of rating groups) would have been evidence that various groups of judges rated items differently. However, a single large factor was found (eigenvalue = 7.86) which accounted for 65.5% of the total variance. The loadings of each of the groups on this factor are presented in Table 2. All of these loadings are high, reflecting the general agreement among judges. However, it can be seen that parents, high school students, and elementary and bilingual coordinators had slightly lower loadings on the factor than the other groups. This pattern, for the parents and high school students at least, is consistent with the pattern of median correlations, and suggests a slightly different view point for these groups. The mean of each group's ratings of the 90 items, presented in Table 2, also indicates a slight divergence of opinion for parents and students, for their means are the two lowest of the 12 groups.

The matrix of mean ratings of the 90 items was further analyzed using a different method: intraclass correlation. This method is based on a random effects analysis of variance model in which judges' ratings are considered repeated measures of subjects (with the data in this study, items correspond to subjects). The intraclass correlation is maximized when subject means differ greatly from one another (when the between-subjects mean square is large) and when judges' ratings are similar within subjects (when the within subjects mean square is small). In the present study, the intraclass correlation will be high if items receive different mean ratings and if the judging groups tend to agree on their ratings of particular items. As Winer (1971) points out, it is desirable in some designs to remove mean rating differences among judging groups before computing the intraclass correlations. Such a procedure removes the effects of tendencies of some groups to rate <u>all</u> items consistently higher or lower than other groups. Since the present analysis was concerned not with judging groups' constant biases but with their relative rank-orderings of the items, mean group difference were removed before the intraclass correlations reported below were computed.

The intraclass correlation obtained from the present study's data was .60. This coefficient can be interpreted as the correlation expected between the ratings of two judging groups chosen randomly from the universe of all possible judging groups. In fact, this coefficient corresponds very well with the median correlation of .605 found when all the groups included in this study were correlated with one another. The intraclass coeffieient is also an estimate of the proportion of true variance to total variance in the ratings. This estimate of 60% true-score variance agrees well with the factor analysis in which 65.5% of the total variance was accounted for by the first factor.

It will be recalled that the 90 competency items were grouped into six categories: personal qualities, procedures and record-keeping skills,

instructional skills, classroom management skills, expertise in basic skills and subject area, and interpersonal skills. Separate intraclass coefficients were computed based on the ratings of the items contained within each of these six categories. These analyses were conducted to determine whether the judging groups showed the same level of agreement for each category, or whether different categories elicited different levels of agreement. Table 3 reports the number of items contained in each category and the respective intraclass coefficients obtained. It can be seen that items relating to instructional skills elicited the greatest agreement among groups. The coefficients obtained for most other categories were comparable to the coeffieient of .60 obtained when all 90 items were considered simultaneously. However, the "procedural and record-keeping skills" category elicited less agreement (r_I = .40) than did the other categories.

In summary, both the factor analysis and the intraclass analysis of the entire questionnaire indicate that the 12 judging groups tended to rank order the competency items similarly. Approximately 60% of the variance of these ratings can be considered common or true-score variance. There are some indications that the non-professional groups (parents and high school students) tend to rate teacher competencies from a viewpoint which is slightly different from the professional groups. In addition, it appears that the 12 groups tend to show some disagreement in rating the importance of procedural and record-keeping skills. But despite these disagreements, there is a high degree of commonality in the way these rather diverse groups rate teacher competencies.

Discussion

The factor analysis and intraclass correlations confirmed the mean rating comparisons among the groups- a high degree of agreement upon which were the most important competencies for effective teachers. The educational importance of this effort is the fact that the competencies upon which teachers are to be evaluated were chosen and validated by the intended users (evaluators and evaluatees) with additional validity supplied by parents, students and education professors and with demonstrated consensus among all the groups. It is not totally surprising that the level of agreement was high on these 90 items since all items were based on a compilation of what the literature(including a wide variety of evaluation instruments) indicated to be important. The parent and student groups tended to give the items slightly lower ratings in general than did teachers and administrators for whom the teacher evaluation instrument is perhaps of more immediate concern.

A look at the literature this past year indicates other researchers and school districts(Johnson,Adams,Okey and Capie, Note 5; Adams, Johnson, Okey and Capie, Note 6; STAR, 1978) are pursuing the general steps out-

lined earlier on identifying and validating teacher competencies.

The next step in the AISD project as well as in the other studies mentioned, is the further validation of the competencies chosen through their actual use. In the AISD case, the competencies were chosen as the basis for the district's teacher evaluation instrument for the 1978-79 school year. Therefore the use of the instrument-particularly the ratings given on the various competencies will be studied extensively. The examination of the ratings is part of the Board-adopted evaluation of the evaluation system as a whole- evaluation instruments, evaluation processes and procedures, the evaluation handbook, administrators' and professionals' attitudes, experiences and concerns about the system and the training given administrators to become better evaluators(Christner, 1978).

Besides fulfilling the requirement of evaluation of teachers for the purposes of determining contract status, one of the major goals in developing this evaluation system was for staff development purposes. The ratings on the items on the previous evaluation system were so high across all categories and the items themselves were so multifacted that there was no real basis for staff development planning. The ratings on the 63 competencies will be examined on a districtwide, schoolwide and individual basis to determine possible staff development needs at each level.

Additionally, it would be desirable to explore the relationship between specific teacher competencies and pupil growth on achievement, cognitive and affective measures. This presents several problems on a practical basis. Matching a specific teacher with the achievement of a specific student on a specific subtest of a standardized achievement test can be next to impossible- for example- when a high school student has three quarters of social studies classes in one year with three different teachers- to which teacher do you attribute his/her gain or loss in scores?

Most school districts seldom have the money, time or staff to conduct the type of long term research this type of issue would entail. Also the technique most often used for long term studies of this type are in-depth,long term observational studies. Besides the time, money and staff constraints, as Borich, Malitz and Kugle(1978) point out, few of the standardized observation instruments have had adequate reliability and validity investigations.

Finally, many of the competencies on the AISD teacher evaluation instrument are not observable in the classroom- i.e. communicates with parents sympathetically, accurately and with understanding. Therefore classroom observation studies would be of no real help in validating these competencies. Our district is strongly encouraging as well as training

administrators to not rely on classroom observations as the only basis upon which they evaluate teachers- observe at parent-teacher conferences, look at lesson plans, examine a variety of student work, examine teacher-developed tests and materials,etc.

The next step in the validation process is the compilation of the data from the evaluation forms. The analyses of the ratings on the competencies will be completed by the end of June of 1979.

Table 1

Intercorrelations of Mean Ratings Obtained from the 12 Groups of Judges

Group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1) Elementary teachers	-	.79	.80	.71	.70	.66	.65	.51	.75	.87	.75	.71
2) Secondary teachers		-	.59	.82	.52	.78	.58	.65	.65	.74	.74	.75
3) Elementary administrators			-	.56	.64	.58	.53	.36	.58	.70	.59	.55
4) Secondary administrators				-	.51	.82	.56	.45	.51	.65	.59	.65
5) Elementary and bilingual coordinators					-	.61	.56	.36	.65	.65	.50	.52
6) Secondary coordinators						-	.53	.49	.54	.58	.60	.56
7) Parents							-	.49	.65	.68	.50	.56
8) High school students								-	.59	.51	.51	.53
9) Education professors									-	.75	.67	.66
10) Elementary special education teachers										_	.74	.68
11) Secondary special education teachers											-	.66
12) Other special education teachers												-

Note: All correlations $p < .001$, $df = 89$.

Table 2

Data Summarizing Each Rating Group's Degree of Agreement

Group	Median Correlation With Other Groups[a]	Loading on First Factor[b]	Item Ratings Mean[c]	Item Ratings S.D.[c]
1) Elementary teachers	.75	.92	4.37	.19
2) Secondary teachers	.74	.8	4.08	.30
3) Elementary administrators	.74	.77	4.41	.24
4) Secondary administrators	.65	.81	4.28	.24
5) Elementary and bilingual coordirators	.61	.74	4.41	.36
6) Secondary coordinators	.60	.80	4.16	.26
7) Parents	.56	.75	4.06	.35
8) High school students	.51	.65	3.74	.27
9) Education professors	.65	.82	4.10	.29
10) Elementary special education teachers	.70	.89	4.31	.23
11) Secondary special education teachers	.66	.81	4.18	.34
12) Other special education teachers	.66	.81	4.27	.29

Notes: a) All correlations, $p < .001$, $df = 89$

b) loadings on first principle components factor (eigen value = 7.86)

c) calculated across the 90 items on the survey

Table 3

Intraclass Correlations for Each Section of the Survey

Section	No. of Items	Intraclass Correlation[a]
Personal qualities	15	.60
Procedural and record keeping skills	8	.40
Instructional skills	25	.69
Classroom management skills	18	.65
Expertise in basic skills and subject area	7	.58
Interpersonal skills	17	.62

Note: a) calculated after adjusting for mean differences among groups

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Carey, L. M. The process used to identify generic skills and construct the generic skills inventory. Unpublished manuscript. Florida State University, 1975.

2. Soar, R. S., Coker, H. and Lorentz, J. L. Using process/product relationships as the basis of describing effective teacher behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977.

3. Lorentz, J. L. The development of measures of teacher effectiveness from multiple measures of student growth. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977.

4. Medley, D. M. An approach to the definition and measurement of teacher competencies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977.

5. Johnson, C. E., Adams, P. T., Okey, J. R. and Capie, W. Verifying teacher competencies for their generic qualities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

6. Adams, P. T., Johnson, C. E., Okey, J. R., and Capie, W. Principals, Supervisors and beginning teachers: Their opinions regarding competencies for the professional certification of teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

REFERENCES

Borich, G. D. and Fenton, K. S. The appraisal of teaching: Concepts and process. Reading, Mass.: Addison - Wesley Publishing Co., 1977.

Borich, G. D., Malitz, D. and Kugle, C. L. Convergent and discriminant validity of five classroom observation systems: Testing a model. Journal of Educational Psychology , 1978, 70, 119-128.

Christner, C. A. Evaluation design: Personnel evaluation systems, 1978-79. Austin: Office of Research and Evaluation, Austin Independent School District, Publication Number 78.01, 1978.

Dodl, N., Gant, J., Nelson, P. and Jung, N. A. Catalog of teacher competencies. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1971.

MacDonald, F. F. Beginning teacher evaluation study: Phase II, 1973-74, Summary report. ED127375, July, 1976.

Rosenshine, B. Teaching behaviors and student achievement. London: National Foundation for Education Research, 1971.

Staff training and renewal (STAR). Staff development program, 1978-79. Policy Manual.

Thomas, A. K. and Kay, P. M. Determining priorities among competencies: Judgments of classroom teachers and supervisors. In R. W. Houston (Ed.), Exploring competency based education. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974.

Wilson, G. Improving teacher effectiveness. Florida Vocational Journal, 1976, 2, 29-30.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw - Hill, 1971.

► Indicates the final 63 items selected for the AISD teacher evaluation form.

Appendix A
Competency Statements

I. Personal and Professional Qualities

A. Personal Qualities

► 1. Is physically capable of performing assigned tasks.
► 2. Is emotionally stable.
► 3. Exhibits poise and self-control.
4. Demonstrates a sense of humor.
► 5. Presents an effective role model.
► 6. Is punctual.
► 7. Behaves rationally and realistically.
► 8. Shows initiative and imagination.
► 9. Uses common sense.
10. Maintains an appropriate appearance.
► 11. Shows enthusiasm for work.
► 12. Communicates effectively and pleasantly.
► 13. Exhibits an overall positive attitude.
14. Participates in district in-service.
► 15. Demonstrates professional growth.

B. Procedural & Record-Keeping Skills

► 1. Keeps school records and reports up-to-date and accurate.
2. Turns in reports on time.
► 3. Recognizes the necessity for and complies with administrative policies and procedures.
► 4. Complies with school board policies and procedures.
5. Complies with central office procedures.
► 6. Complies with local campus routines.
7. Plans lessons to coordinate where possible with other curriculum areas.
► 8. Documents student progress effectively.

II. Teaching Effectiveness

A. Instructional Skills

► 1. Prepares written lesson plans whose instructional objectives are evident to students and self.
► 2. Employs creative and imaginative approaches to teaching.
► 3. Designs lessons which incorporate a variety of materials, instructional techniques, and learning activities.
► 4. Presents subject matter appropriate to the needs, abilities, and interests of students.
5. Utilizes teaching and learning materials available from sources outside the classroom.
► 6. Makes clear to students standards for learning performance.
► 7. Diagnoses individual and class difficulties.

8. Introduces activities and provides closure at the appropriate points.
► 9. Moves around the room at times, rather than teaching seated behind the desk.
► 10. Plans instruction around needed student competencies.
► 11. Prepares appropriate tests and evaluation activities to measure student learning.
12. Administers standardized tests properly.
13. Interprets standardized test data accurately.
► 14. Interprets own tests and evaluation activities accurately.
15. Reports test data competently to students.
► 16. Reports test and evaluation data competently to parents.
► 17. Uses formal and informal means for assessing student learning.
► 18. Designs lessons and units with clear, logical and sequential content.
► 19. Paces instruction to suit students' concentration and interest span.
20. Provides balance between students' active involvement and independent work.
► 21. Utilizes a variety of questioning strategies.
22. Utilizes flexible grouping of students.
23. Arranges attractive purposeful bulletin boards and displays.
24. Provides flexible seating arrangements to facilitate instruction and interaction.
► 25. Makes assignments appropriate to the student's instructional level.

B. Classroom Management Skills

► 1. Uses a variety of motivational strategies.
2. Provides opportunities for each pupil to gain recognition by his peer group.
3. Gives careful attention to the physical condition and appearance of the classroom.
► 4. Maintains class control in an atmosphere conducive to learning.
► 5. Organizes the class routine so that little time is lost in transition from one learning activity to another.
► 6. Organizes the classroom for quick and efficient distribution of learning materials.
7. Arranges for students to help each other when the teacher is occupied.
► 8. Has a lesson plan for the day so that each student moves smoothly through the day's learning activities.
► 9. Uses management procedures which prevent behavior problems from arising.
10. Organizes a system to give students responsibility for care of the classroom and its supplies and equipment.
► 11. Uses behavior management techniques which preserve student and teacher dignity and self-esteem if problems arise.

► 12. Practices positive reinforcement techniques.
► 13. Allocates time to include presentation of all appropriate content.
14. Maintains a reasonable noise level.
► 15. Provides enrichment activities for students who complete assigned work.
► 16. Involves all students in learning activities.
17. Maintains harmonious work in several small groups at the same time.
► 18. Is prepared to begin teaching at the beginning of each period.

C. Expertise in Basic Skills and Subject Areas

► 1. Has knowledge and a broad background in subjects taught.
► 2. Is well informed concerning latest developments in content fields.
► 3. Demonstrates knowledge and ability to use the basic essentials of standard English; in oral and written communication and in spelling.
► 4. Demonstrates knowledge and ability to use the basic essentials of mathematics skills and concepts.
5. Has understanding of dialect/language differences among students.
► 6. Presents information verbally in a clear and understandable fashion.
► 7. Teaches lessons and units that reflect the AISD curricula.

III. Interpersonal Skills

► 1. Fosters positive self-images in students.
► 2. Fosters students' self-control and self-direction.
► 3. Is consistent in relationships with students.
► 4. Is cordial in relationships with students.
► 5. Treats students impartially.
► 6. Is adaptable when dealing with individual and cultural differences.
► 7. Communicates with students sympathetically, accurately and with understanding.
8. Works with parents regularly towards the students' best interests.
9. Accepts criticism or recognition gracefully.
10. Consistently promotes friendly relationships through active participation in faculty groups and meetings.
►11. Works effectively with teachers, student teachers and support personnel.
12. Maintains constructive relationships with school and district administration.
►13. Recognizes and responds to contributions of students.
►14. Respects students' rights and encourages their sense of responsibility.
15. Encourages students to assume leadership.
►16. Establishes a warm relationship with students.
►17. Communicates with parents sympathetically, accurately and with understanding.

COMPETENCY SURVEY (FORM 1203J1) PAGE 1

YOUR STAFF POSITION (CHECK ONE)

( ) ELEMENTARY TEACHER ( ) SPECIAL ED TEACHER
( ) SECONDARY TEACHER ( ) TITLE I SPECIALIST
( ) COUNSELOR ( ) DEPARTMENT HEAD
( ) LIBRARIAN ( ) OTHER

YOUR SCHOOL _____

YOUR SEX _____

NO. YEARS EXPERIENCE _____

GRADES TAUGHT 1) _____ NO. PERIODS
2) _____
3) _____

SUBJECTS TAUGHT 1) _____
2) _____
3) _____

INSTRUCTIONS:
1. COMPLETE ALL INFORMATION ABOVE.
2. READ EACH COMPETENCY STATEMENT IN COLUMN I.
3. IN COLUMN II CIRCLE THE VALUE OF EACH COMPENTENCY TO TEACHER PERFORMANCE.
4. IN COLUMN III CIRCLE WHETHER THE COMPETENCY IS ONE WHERE MANY TEACHERS COULD USE IMPROVEMENT.
5. IN COLUMN IV GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF A BEHAVIOR QUALIFYING AS OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE IN THE COMPETENCY AREA.
6. IN COLUMN V GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF A BEHAVIOR QUALIFYING AS VERY POOR PERFORMANCE IN THE COMPETENCY AREA.
7. IN COLUMN VI PLACE A CHECK MARK IF THE COMPETENCY STATEMENT WAS DIFFICULT FOR YOU TO UNDERSTAND.

I. COMPETENCY STATEMENT	II. VALUE TO PERFORMANCE (NOT VALUABLE / LITTLE VALUE / SOMEWHAT VALUABLE / VERY VALUABLE / ESSENTIAL)	III. IS THIS A COMPETENCY IN WHICH MANY TEACHERS COULD USE IMPROVEMENT (YES / NO)	IV. GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF A BEHAVIOR QUALIFYING AS OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE IN EACH COMPETENCY AREA.	V. GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF A BEHAVIOR QUALIFYING AS VERY POOR PERFORMANCE IN EACH COMPETENCY AREA.	VI
1. (2A19) PACES INSTRUCTION TO SUIT STUDENTSS CONCENTRATION AND INTEREST SPAN.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2			
2. (2B3) GIVES CAREFUL ATTENTION TO THE PHYSICAL CONDITION AND APPEARANCE OF THE CLASSROOM.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2			
3. (1A3) EXHIBITS POISE AND SELF-CONTROL.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2			
4. (2A18) DESIGNS LESSONS AND UNITS WITH CLEAR, LOGICAL AND SEQUENTIAL CONTENT.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2			
5. (2C1) HAS KNOWLEDGE AND A BROAD BACKGROUND IN SUBJECTS TAUGHT.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2			

COMPETENCY SURVEY (FORM 12031)

6. (2C2) IS WELL INFORMED CONCERNING LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN CONTENT FIELDS.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
7. (1B8) DOCUMENTS STUDENT PROGRESS EFFECTIVELY.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
8. (1B4) COMPLIES WITH SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
9. (2A9) MOVES AROUND THE ROOM AT TIMES, RATHER THAN TEACHING SEATED BEHIND THE DESK.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
10. (3A5) TREATS STUDENTS IMPARTIALLY.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
11. (2A8) INTRODUCES ACTIVITIES AND PROVIDES CLOSURE AT THE APPROPRIATE POINTS.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
12. (2B18) IS PREPARED TO BEGIN TEACHING AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH PERIOD.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
13. (3A17) COMMUNICATES WITH PARENTS SYMPATHETICALLY, ACCURATELY AND WITH UNDERSTANDING	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
14. (2B1) USES A VARIETY OF MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
15. (3A3) IS CONSISTENT IN RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2
16. (1A7) BEHAVES RATIONALLY AND REALISTICALLY.	1 2 3 4 5	1	2

PLEASE RETURN THROUGH SCHOOL MAIL TO ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, BOX 20. THANK YOU.